

SUMMARY OF THE TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

A telephone interview was conducted on Wednesday, September 19, 2007 between David J. McKenzie (Applicant's representative), Tyler S. Nield (Applicant's representative), Charles D. Adams (Examiner), and Cam Y. Truong (Primary Examiner). The interview was initiated by Applicant via an Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form that was faxed on September 13, 2007 and the details of the interview are as follows:

- A. Brief Description of the nature of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted.
 - a. There were no exhibits or demonstrations shown.
- B. Identification of the claims discussed.
 - a. Claims 1-7 and 9-16 were listed in the interview agenda, but the discussion was substantially focused on the subject matter of Claim 1.
- C. Identification of specific prior art discussed.
 - a. The prior art specifically discussed was the article, "A Machine Learning Approach to Web Mining" by Esposito et al. (hereinafter "Esposito") and the U.S. Pre-Grant Publication 2003/0154181 to Liu et al. (hereinafter "Liu"). References were also made to the prior art generally including the prior art of record.
- D. Identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature.
 - a. Applicant proposed an amendment to Claim 1 with the additional limitation "wherein said unnecessary word determination means determines a word is an unnecessary word in response to the word having a lesser number of occurrences than a given standard in the at least one other category, the given standard comprised of a predetermined threshold scaled by the number of documents in the at least one other category." That proposed amendment is included herein as a current amendment to independent Claims 1, 6, 10, and 14.
- E. General thrust of the principal arguments of the applicant and the examiner.

- a. Applicant proposed the aforementioned amendment to Claim 1 and argued that the amendment was sufficient to overcome any § 102 or § 103 rejections based on the prior art of record. Examiner Adams agreed and Examiner Truong confirmed that the amendment would place Claim 1 in condition to overcome the prior art of record. Examiner Adams indicated that he would perform an additional prior art search and notify Applicant if any additional pertinent art is located that may anticipate Claim 1 as recited with the proposed amendment.

F. Pertinent matters discussed.

- a. No additional pertinent matters were discussed. The interview agenda included a discussion of the combination of Esposito and Liu as well as the combination of Esposito, Liu, and Grasso, but the arguments have become moot in light of the agreement reached regarding the proposed amendment to Claim 1.

G. General outcome of the interview.

- a. Applicant's representatives and Examiner Adams and Truong reached an agreement that the proposed amendment was sufficient to overcome rejections based on the prior art of record including Esposito and Liu.